

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

DESIGN BASICS, L.L.C.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	8:13CV125
)	
v.)	
)	
CARHART LUMBER COMPANY,)	ORDER
SCOTT BRIAN CARHART,)	
BRENDA KUHLMAN CARHART,)	
WILLIAM C. CARHART, and)	
MICHAEL HERBOLSHEIMER,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

This matter is before the court on Plaintiff’s Statement of Objections to Magistrate Judge’s Memorandum and Order. (Filing [49](#).) At issue is Magistrate Judge Zwart’s order (Filing [48](#)) denying Plaintiff’s motion to compel discovery (Filing [31](#)) and granting Defendants’ motion for protective order (Filing [34](#)).

Because I find after careful review that the order is not “clearly erroneous or contrary to law,” the Statement of Objections will be denied. See [28 U.S.C. § 636\(b\)\(1\)\(A\)](#); [Fed. R. Civ. P. 72\(a\)](#); [NECivR 72.2](#). See also [Hajek v. Kumho Tire Co., Inc.](#), No. 4:08CV3157, 2010 WL 1292447, at *2 (D. Neb. Mar. 30, 2010) (“In discovery matters, the magistrate judge is afforded great deference,” and I may reverse a Magistrate Judge’s decision only when clearly erroneous or contrary to law; “While the standard of relevance in the context of discovery is broader than in the context of admissibility . . . [,] this often intoned legal tenet should not be misapplied so as to allow fishing expeditions in discovery.”); [Brooks v. Lincoln Nat’l Life Ins. Co.](#), No. 8:05CV118, 2006 WL 2487937, at *3 (D. Neb. Aug. 25, 2006) (“Under a clearly erroneous standard, a district court can reverse a magistrate judge’s order only if the court is left with the definite and firm conviction that a mistake has been committed.”);

“Under a contrary to law standard, a district court can reverse a magistrate judge’s order only if the order fails to apply the relevant law.”).

Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED:

1. Plaintiff’s Statement of Objections to Magistrate Judge’s Memorandum and Order (Filing [49](#)) is denied; and
2. The Magistrate Judge’s Memorandum and Order (Filing [48](#)) denying Plaintiff’s motion to compel discovery (Filing [31](#)) and granting Defendants’ motion for protective order (Filing [34](#)) shall not be disturbed and is hereby sustained.

DATED this 26th day of January, 2015.

BY THE COURT:

Richard G. Kopf

Senior United States District Judge

*This opinion may contain hyperlinks to other documents or Web sites. The U.S. District Court for the District of Nebraska does not endorse, recommend, approve, or guarantee any third parties or the services or products they provide on their Web sites. Likewise, the court has no agreements with any of these third parties or their Web sites. The court accepts no responsibility for the availability or functionality of any hyperlink. Thus, the fact that a hyperlink ceases to work or directs the user to some other site does not affect the opinion of the court.